

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application.

Claims 9-14 were allowed.

Claims 3-7 and 17-21 were objected to.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 15-16, and 22 were rejected.

Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claims 3-7 and 17-21 (as being dependent on a rejected claim) be held in abeyance until a final determination is made concerning the claims on which these claims are dependent.

Claim Rejection:

Claims 1, 2, 8, 15-16, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art in figure 2 of the instant application, in view of Mazzola et al. (U.S. 5,796,732).

Applicant's method includes using a first and a second processor to process packets. Each of the processors performs a routing table lookup. Thus, there are two routing table lookup operations. The invention recited in claims 1, 2, 8, 15-16, and 22 is directed to **a technique for facilitating the second routing table lookup operation.** More specifically the method as for example defined in claim 1 includes:

- a) "using a first processorto perform a routing table lookup for a received packet"
- b) "determining from the routing table lookup, a routing table identifier....",
- c) "passing the identifier and the received packet to the second processor "
and
- c) "the second processor retrieves routing information for the received packet from a routing table, using the identifier....".

The examiner correctly notes that the prior art system shown in applicant's Figure 2 shows a forwarding engine 58 which performs traditional routing tasks. That is, the forwarding engine 58 shown in applicant's Figure 2 performs a routing table lookup to determine the "next hop" for each packet.

An important point is that the system shown in Figure 2 has one single forwarding engine that does a routing table look up. Stated differently, in the system shown in applicant's Figure 2, all routing table lookup is done by a single processor.

Similarly the system shown in the Mazzola reference has one single forwarding unit 125 that examines the destination addresses. See Mazzole column 3, line 51, which states "The forwarding engine 125 is located on the supervisor card 120." In the Mozzole reference there is only one single processor that does a routing table lookup.

Thus, both of the references cited by the examiner show a system that has a single forwarding engine that examines a routing table. These references certainly can not suggest passing an identifier between the processors to facilitate the routing table lookup operation by a second processor.

The applicant is claiming a system that includes two processors that examine routing tables. Applicant claims a technique whereby the examination of the routing table by the second processor is **facilitated by the use of an identifier received from the first processor**.

There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion of the applicant's invention in the cited references.

Allowance of claims 1, 2, 8, 5-16 and 22 is therefore respectfully requested. It is noted that allowance of claims 1, 2, 8, 15-16 and 22 would eliminate the objection to claims 3-7 and 17-21.

Conclusion:

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-22 is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Elmer W. Galbi
Registration No. 19,761

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office via facsimile number
(571) 273-8300, on March 8, 2006.


Beth Nichols